

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 60-63, 67, 69 and 72-75 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 53-75 are now pending in this application with claims 53-59 being withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 60-63, 65-66 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection Applicants have amended claims 60-63, 65 and 73 to clarify further that the claimed method steps are tied to a particular machine. Further, claim 73 has been amended to recite a computer readable medium for storing a program executed on a computer. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 60-63, 65-66 and 73 be allowed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 66 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 66 and 72 to adhere to the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn and claims 66 and 72 be allowed.

Claim Objections

Claim 62 was objected to for informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claim 62 to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 60-64, 66-70 and 72-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,773,344 (“Gabai”). In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have amended independent claims 60, 67, 73, 74 and 75. Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants rely on M.P.E.P. § 2131, entitled “Anticipation – Application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e)” which states, “a claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Gabai does not describe each and every element of the claims.

Independent claim 60 is directed to “a method of processing information” comprising in addition to other elements “analyzing inputted text with an information analysis unit to determine information to be added comprising the steps of: *classifying the inputted text as one of a plurality of types of sentences; selecting a category of additional information related to the type of sentence; and selecting additional information in the selected category*” (emphasis added). Independent claims 67 and 73-75 recite similar limitations.

In contrast, Gabai does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claims 60, 67 and 73- 75.

Gabai is directed to interactive toys. The Office Action asserts that col. 43, lines 3-19 meets the claim limitation “analyzing inputted text” as recited in claim 60. In view of the clarifying amendments made in this reply, Applicants respectfully disagree.

The passage cited by the examiner discusses in very general terms how a toy may be used to translate a spoken language. Specifically, Col. 43, lines 11-14 of Gabai discloses that the toy may combine its translations with other content that is appropriate to the given situation. However, translating a spoken language is not identical to “analyzing inputted text” by “*classifying the inputted text as one of a plurality of types of sentences.*” That is, Gabai does not disclose, teach or suggest classifying input by the type of sentence. Accordingly, Gabai fails to disclose each and every element as claimed in the amended independent claims 60, 67 and 73-75.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 states that “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *See In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Here, Gabai fails to disclose each and every limitation in as complete detail as is contained in amended independent claims 60, 67 and 73-75.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and independent claims 60, 67 and 73-75 be allowed. Further, claims 61-66, 68-72 depend from one of claims 60 or 67 and should be allowed for the reasons set forth above.

If this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in Gabai.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 65 and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,513,011 (“Uwakubo”). As set forth above, Gabai fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 60, 67 and 73-75. Claims 65 and 71 depend from one of independent claims 60 and 67 and should be allowed for the reasons set forth above without regard to further patentable limitations contained therein. Further, Uwakubo fails to cure the deficiencies of Gabai. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 7/2/2009

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072

W. Keith Robinson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,396